

App. No. 10/065,749

In the Drawings:

Corrected Drawings are attached.

App. No. 10/065,749

REMARKS - General

The Examiner quotes US Publication No. 2003/0192029 by Hughes in a Section 102 rejection of the Applicant's application. The Application respectfully argues that the Hughes Application is not proper prior art for the current Application. Hughes claims priority to U.S. provisional patent application serial No. 60/370,937, filed Apr. 8, 2002. The Applicant respectfully argues that the Hughes application is not proper prior art as the Application's invention pre-dates the filing of Hughes.


The Application further argues that the Hughes System is different from the Applicant's invention. In their system, the Manager there is a person where in the Applicant's invention the Manager is a software process. The Applicant's invention has more to do with writing the software, while Hughes details the process of bidding, managing the development process.

Also applicants have rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over prior art. Therefore the applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey M. Furr, Esq.
Registration No. 38,146

I hereby certify I have transmitted this paper by fax to the Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300 on August 9, 2006.

August 9, 2006



Jeffrey M. Furr, Esq, Reg. No. 38,146.